



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/065,315	10/02/2002	Ina Ullrich	FMC 1469 PUS / 201-1041	7693
28395	7590	08/21/2006	EXAMINER	
BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C./FGTL 1000 TOWN CENTER 22ND FLOOR SOUTHFIELD, MI 48075-1238				ADE, OGER GARCIA
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		3627		

DATE MAILED: 08/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/065,315	ULLRICH ET AL.
	Examiner Garcia Ade	Art Unit 3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 October 2002.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 02 October 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/21/02</u> .	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.
--	--

DETAILED ACTION***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. [US 7,010,507], and further in view of Jensen et al. [US 6,438,528].

As per claims 1, 9, 17, and 20, Anderson discloses a computer-implemented method for determining and reporting value added tax information comprising: receiving transaction information from a plurality of computerized invoice systems [see figures 1 and 2, and column 3, lines 1 – 16]; determining value added tax information based on the transaction information [see claim 6 (e.g. **determining an anticipated refund amount based on said electronic taxpayer tax return data**)]; transmitting the value added tax information to the plurality of computerized invoice systems [see column 2, lines 24 – 40 (e.g. **transmitting the electronic tax data files to a relevant taxing authority**), and see claim 6 (e.g. **transmitting from said electronic data processing system to a credit card issuer computer system said anticipated refund amount**)];

receiving a value added tax amount for the business transaction determined by the plurality of computerized invoice systems based on the value added tax information [see claim 1 (e.g. creating a deposit/payment account designated to **receive by electronic funds transfer said tax refund from said relevant taxing authority**)].

Anderson does not explicitly disclose generating an at least one report based on the value added tax amount and the value added tax information. However, Jensen discloses generating an at least one report based on the value added tax amount and the value added tax information [see column 7, lines 12 – 16 (e.g. **reports** for transmission)].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary art at the time of the invention was made to modify Anderson's invention to include Jensen's report method. The motivation to combine will provide a transaction manager that includes: a dispatcher connected to an input queue, one or more output queues and one or more processing module queues, input data handling means, responsive to transaction requests received from one or more clients [see disclosure of the invention].

As per claims 2 and 10, Anderson discloses receiving general ledger information [see claim 3 (e.g. a fourth electronic **record comprising an account balance**)].

As per claims 3 and 11, Anderson discloses the general ledger information includes at least tax account information and tax jurisdiction information [see figure 2 (e.g. block 160), and column 4, lines 33 – 39 (e.g. **accurate tax information**)].

As per claims 4 and 12, Anderson discloses reconciling the value added tax information, the value added tax amounts, and general ledger information [see claim 3 (e.g. an electronic data processing system for preparing and *submitting tax return data*)].

As per claims 5, 6, 8, 13 - 16, 18, and 19, Anderson discloses the determining step includes determining tax decision rules based on the transaction information to obtain value added tax information [see claims 6 and 12].

Anderson does not explicitly disclose the tax decision rules are developed using a VTR table; the transaction information includes at least shipping information; and the value added tax information includes at least tax rate and tax type. However, Jensen discloses the tax decision rules are developed using a VTR table [see column 4, lines 26 – 32 (e.g. the system includes a **table of VAT treatment** practices for all existing scenarios to determine VAT)]; the transaction information includes at least shipping information [via customer database API mode, column 6, line 36, and column 7, line 47]; and the value added tax information includes at least tax rate and tax type [see column 4, lines 50 – 59 (e.g. customer VAT rate applicable)].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary art at the time of the invention was made to modify Anderson's invention to include Jensen's table of VAT treatment, and shipping information. The motivation to combine is the same as claims 1, 9, 17, and 20 above.

Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Garcia Ade whose telephone number is 571.272.5586. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM - 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on 571.272.6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

4. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Garcia Ade
Examiner
Art Unit 3627

ga

*Jessica Gary 8/7/06
Primary Examiner*